ORIGINAL

Dee May
Executive Director
Federal Regulatory

verizon

1300 I Street N.W., 400W
Washington, DC 20005

Phone 202.336.7824
Fax 202.336.7922
dolores.a.may@verizon.com

December 1, 2000

Ex Parte

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th St., S.W. – Portals
Washington, DC 20554

RE: Application by Verizon New England Inc., et al., for Authorization To Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Massachusetts, Docket No. 00-176

Dear Ms. Salas:

The enclosed information was provided pursuant to the request of D. Attwood, CCB. The enclosure includes redacted information. A confidential version is also being filed. Please let me know if you have any questions. The twenty-page limit does not apply as set forth in DA 00-2159.

Sincerely,

Dee May

Redacted Enclosure

cc: D. Attwood
E. Einhorn
S. Pie

REDACTED – FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION

Dee May
Executive Director
Federal Regulatory

verizon

1300 I Street N.W., 400W
Washington, DC 20005

Phone 202.336.7824
Fax 202.336.7922
dolores.a.may@verizon.com

November 30, 2000

Ex Parte

Ms. Dorothy Attwood
Chief-Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
445 12 Street, SW, Fifth Floor
Washington, DC 20554

RE: Application by Verizon New England Inc., et al., for Authorization to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Massachusetts, Docket No. 00-176

Dear Ms. Attwood:

We are providing the following information pursuant to requests from you and your staff:

1. We examined whether two large CLECs are rejecting week-end maintenance appointments for DSL. As the attached chart demonstrates, these CLECs (or there customers) are rejecting week-end maintenance appointments in roughly the same percentages as CLECs in total. (Attachment A—please note that this is document contains Confidential CLEC specific data.)

2. We are providing additional information on how we calculated the total DSL network trouble report rates. (Attachment B) The actual calculation is attached. The CLEC DSL network trouble report rate can be calculated from information already included in Verizon's Carrier to Carrier Performance Reports. This can be done by dividing the total number of trouble reports received from CLECs in a month (where trouble was found) by the total number of DSL loops in service at the end of the month. The total number of CLEC trouble reports is the number of observations in MR-4-01 (Mean Time To Repair – Total). The total number of DSL loops in service at the end of the month is the number of observations in MR-2-02 (Network Trouble Report Rate – Loop). Alternatively, this calculation can be made by adding together the Network Trouble Report Rate – Loop (MR-2-02) and the Network Trouble Report Rate – Central Office (MR-2-03).

   The Retail DSL network trouble report rate can be calculated in the same manner, with one exception. The total number of retail trouble reports received each month for DSL service is the number of observations in MR-4-01 (Mean Time To Repair –

REDACTED—FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION

Total). The total number of retail DSL lines in service at the end of the month, however, is not listed on Verizon's Carrier to Carrier Performance Reports because that information ha only become available recently in connection with Verizon's formation of the Separate Data Affiliate. (The DSL Network Trouble Report Rate – Loop listed on Verizon's Carrier to Carrier Performance Reports is actually Verizon's POTS performance.) We used the information on the number of retail DSL lines in service to calculate the retail DSL network trouble report rate on the attached chart.

3. We have calculated the percentage of CLEC trouble reports submitted within 30 days of the installation of DSL service where no trouble was found using information included in Verizon's Carrier to Carrier Performance Reports. A copy of the calculation is attached. (Attachment C) The answer is derived from by dividing the number of trouble reports where no trouble was found by the total number of trouble reports submitted. The number of trouble reports received from CLECs within 30 days of the installation of an xDSL loop where no trouble was found can be determined by multiplying PR-6-03 (% Install Troubles Reported within 30 days – FOK/TOK/CPE) by the number of observations for that metric. The number of trouble reports received from CLECs within 30 days of the installation of an xDSL loop where trouble was found can be determined by multiplying PR-6-01 (% Install Troubles Reported within 30 days) by the number of observations for that metric. The percentage of trouble reports where no trouble was found can then be calculated by dividing the number of trouble reports where no trouble was found by the total number of trouble reports (where trouble was found and where trouble was not found).

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Attachments

xDSL Rejected Weekend Appointments **CLEC TOTAL**

May-00	Retail Volume	UNE Volume
Rec Friday (All)	29	53
Rec Fri. - Took Mon. appt.	7	31
% Sat. appt. rejected	**24.14%**	**58.49%**

Jun-00	Retail Volume	UNE Volume
Rec Friday (All)	36	54
Rec Fri. - Took Mon. appt.	4	37
% Sat. appt. rejected	**11.11%**	**68.52%**

Jul-00	Retail Volume	UNE Volume
Rec Friday (All)	64	50
Rec Fri. - Took Mon. appt.	4	27
% Sat. appt. rejected	**6.25%**	**54.00%**

Weighted Average	Retail Volume	UNE Volume
Rec Friday (All)	129	157
Rec Fri. - Took Mon. appt.	15	95
% Sat. appt. rejected	**11.63%**	**60.51%**

MASSACHUSETTS xDSL NETWORK TROUBLE REPORT RATE						
		JUNE	JULY	AUGUST	SEPTEMBER	4 MONTH AVG
Retail	Network Trouble Reports MR-4-01 (VZ observations)	233	392	437	568	1630
	Lines in Service SDA end of month in service totals	8735	10011	12949	18223	49918
	Trouble Report Rate MR-4-01/SDA end of month in service totals	**2.67**	**3.92**	**3.37**	**3.12**	**3.27**
CLEC	Network Trouble Reports MR-4-01 (All CLECs observations)	338	339	353	477	1507
	Lines in Service MR-2-02 (All CLECs observations)	9458	10723	11419	14003	45603
	Trouble Report Rate MR-4-01/MR-2-02	**3.57**	**3.16**	**3.09**	**3.41**	**3.30**

Trouble Reports Submitted on xDSL Loops

	May	June	July	August	September
1) PR-6-01 Performance (%)	7.94	6.20	8.46	7.56	5.44
2) PR-6-03 Performance (%)	10.8	9.85	10.92	9.58	6.90
3) Number of Observations	1537	1838	1465	1190	3014
4) Number of DSL loops for which CLECs submitted Trouble Reports within 30 Days of installation and trouble was found (PR-6-01) (L1 * L3/100)	122	114	124	90	164
5) Number of DSL loops for which CLECs submitted Trouble Reports within 30 Days of installation and trouble was not found (PR-6-03) (L2*L3/100)	166	181	160	114	208
6) Percent of Trouble Reports submitted by CLECs where no trouble found (L5/(L4+L5)	**57.63**	**61.37**	**56.35**	**55.89**	**55.92**
7) Weighted average (number of observations each month multipled by the percentage of troubles not found each month, summed for all months and then divided by the total number of observations for all months	**May - July = 58.66**		**May - Sept = 57.38**		